

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/505,385	02/16/2000	Erik P. Staats	APPL-P2827	6463
75	590 10/02/2003		EXAMINER	
VictorJ. Gallo			WON, YOUNG N	
Sierra Patent Gr P O BOX 6149			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Stateline, NV 89449			2155	
,			DATE MAILED: 10/02/2003	, 8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			PRE			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/505,385	STAATS, ERIK P.				
, avious , i.e.e.	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Young N Won	2155				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 30 September 2003 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applic 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date o	•	Colored District				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THate on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S I36(a) and the appropriate	See MPEP e extension fee			
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	d statutory period for reply originally set in	the final Office action; or	(2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the			
(d)  they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.			
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	I be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NO	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-13</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Exan	niner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						



Continuation of 2. NOTE: Amended claim 1 raises new issues that would require further searching from the examiner. In response to the remarks regarding claim 5 and 9: the detecting a transport when receiving A V/C transaction data, is inherent when a device is detected as taught by the reference since Takayama teaches that the system "realizes the functions" and can "perform communications suitable for each function" (see abstract); the reference clearly teaches of a transport ID; the notifying of any layer of it's ID is inherent and are attached to the data in the form of headers (see col.8, lines 50-54); in addition to the reference location and for clarity, see col.8 lines 7-13, which clearly teaches the limitation of indexing the transport ID; and in addition to the reference location and for clarity, see Fig.3 and col.4, lines 23-31, Takayama clearly teaches associating transport with a device. The arguments suggest patentability based on the reference not specifically pointing out the limitations, but hese limitations are inherent and/or clearly suggested by Takayama.

HOSAIN ALAM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER